



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

B

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,049	11/01/2005	Eva Kontsekova	SONN:066US	5434
32425	7590	04/05/2006	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. 600 CONGRESS AVE. SUITE 2400 AUSTIN, TX 78701			LEAVITT, MARIA GOMEZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/521,049	KONTSEKOVA ET AL.
	Examiner Maria Leavitt	Art Unit 1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 17-33 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 17-33 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

Election/Restriction

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

Lack of Unity Requirement

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claims 17-24 drawn to a transgenic non-human animal having germ and/or somatic cells, which comprise a DNA construct coding for a modified tau protein.
- II. Claims 25-27, drawn to a screening assay system for treatment, preventing and/or diagnosis of a tauopathy.
- III. Claim 28-33, a method for assaying the efficacy of substances or therapies using a transgenic non-human animal coding for a modified tau protein

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical reasons:

37 CFR 1.475 (c) states:

“If an application contains to more or less than one of the combinations of categories of invention set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, unity of invention might not be present”

37 CFR 1.475 (d) also states:

“If multiple products, processes of manufacture, or uses are claimed, the first invention of the category first mentioned in the claims of the application and the first recited invention of each of the other categories related thereto will be considered as the main invention in the claims, see PCT article 17(3)(a) and 1.476(c)”.

In view of 37 CFR 1.475 (c) and 37 CFR 1.475 (d), Group I is considered the main invention that is drawn to the first product in the claims of the application and the first method of use, e.g., a screening assay system for treatment, preventing and/or diagnosis of a tauopathy as recited in claim 25.

Claims of Group I and Group II do not share a common technical feature. Group I is drawn to a transgenic non-human animal having germ and/or somatic cells, which comprise a DNA construct coding for a modified tau protein. Group II drawn to a screening assay system for treatment, preventing and/or diagnosis of a tauopathy. Group II comprises a screening assay for an Alzheimer's tauopathy disease that can be performed by other assays in addition to using a transgenic animal model. Alzheimer's Disease can be screened by test such as the commonly used Mini Mental State Examination (MMSE) developed by Folstein and Colleagues or a recent neurocognitive-screening test, the Seven Minute Screen. Hence, the assay system for screening Alzheimer's Disease has been taught in prior art. Therefore, the technical feature linking the invention of groups I-III does not constitute a special technical feature as defined b PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over prior art.

Groups III is drawn to a method that do not share the same inventive concept as Group I or Group II. The claimed inventions of Groups III recite a method comprising assaying the efficacy of neurofibrillary pathology reducing therapies.

Thus each invention is directed to distinct goals, which comprise a transgenic non-human animal (Group I), a screening assay system for treatment, preventing and/or diagnosis of a tauopathy (Group II), and a method for assaying the efficacy of substances or therapies (Group III). Hence, it follows from the preceding analysis that the claimed inventions listed as Groups I to III do not relate to a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the reasons set forth above.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Should Group I be elected, restriction is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PTC Rule 13.1

1) Applicant is required to choose one source of cell line, e.g., germ or somatic, as recited in claim 1.

2) Applicant is required to select cells that are transiently transfected or stably transfected, as recited in 18.

Should Group II be elected, restriction is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

3) Applicant is required to choose one of the screening assays for tauopathy, as recited in claim 25, from the following group,

i) treatment

ii) prevention

iii) diagnosis

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclose species for each of the groups above, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claim 1 is a generic claim.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Thus, it would be unduly burdensome for the examiner to search all of the claimed inventions being sought in the pending claims.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria Leavitt whose telephone number is 571-272-1085. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nguyen Dave can be reached on 571-272-0731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maria Leavitt, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner P/1633
Remsen 2B64
Phone: 571-272-1085
Email: maria.leavitt@uspto.gov


JANET L. EPPS, FORD, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER